UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,367	03/16/2001	Gustavo R. Rivera	COVA-003/00US	9210

			EXAMINER
22903	7590	06/28/2004	ZHONG, CHAD

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
ATTN: PATENT GROUP
11951 FREEDOM DRIVE, SUITE 1700
ONE FREEDOM SQUARE- RESTON TOWN CENTER
RESTON, VA 20190-5061

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/810,367	RIVERA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chad Zhong	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 July 2002*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 July 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5, 6*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

2.   It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in specification

and claims, the line numbers in the claims do not correspond to the preferred format. The

preferred format is to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1.

For ease of reference by both the Examiner and Applicant <u>all</u> future correspondence should

include the recommended line numbering.

3.   The drawing is objected to because of the following informalities:

Drawings on Figure 5B should be changed as follows:

     "Document Upload Module 170" changed to "Document Upload Module 175"

     "Document Download Module 175" changed to "Document Download Module 170"

This change is necessary to correlate with specifications on pages 17-18.

It is not clearly indicated where "185" exists on pg 22, line 2; Appropriate correction is required.

4.   The use of the trademark Java on Java 2 Enterprise Edition (J2EE), Sun Microsystems,

Oracle RDBMS among others have been noted in this application (pg 25-26). It should be

capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Appropriate

correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

     A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

     (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United

States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

6.   Claims 1-3, 5-9, 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

DeRose et al. (hereinafter DeRose), US 6,167,409.

7.   As per claim 1, DeRose teaches a method for remotely viewing a centrally stored

document, the method comprising:

receiving a user identifier associated with a user attempting to view the document (Col. 16,

lines 31-41);

retrieving relationship data associated with the user (Col. 15, lines 5-10; Col. 9, lines 1-5);

receiving, from the user, a request to view the document (Col. 5,lines 30-47);

retrieving a style sheet associated with the user and the requested document (Col. 5, lines 30-

47; Col. 13, lines 27-35);

retrieving data associated with the document (Col. 14, lines 32-40); and

rendering the retrieved data according to the retrieved style sheet (Col. 14, lines 45-50; Col.

13, lines 27-36; Col. 14, lines 32-40).

8.   As per claim 2, DeRose teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of retrieving

relationship data comprises:

retrieving an employee-type indicator associated with the user (Col. 15, lines 5-10; Col. 16,

lines 32-42; Col. 9, lines 1-5).

9.   As per claim 3, DeRose teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of retrieving

relationship data comprises:

retrieving an organizational-level indicator associated with the user (Col. 15, lines 5-10; Col.

16, lines 32-42; Col. 9, lines 1-5).

10.   As per claim 5, DeRose teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the retrieved data

includes a plurality of data fields and wherein the step of rendering the retrieved data according to

the retrieved style sheet comprises:

hiding a first of the plurality of data fields so that the first of the plurality of fields is not

displayable for the user (Col. 13, lines 54-57; Col. 15, lines 35-44).

11.   As per claim 6, DeRose teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of rendering the

retrieved data according to the retrieved style sheet comprises:

generating a selectable action item, wherein the selectable action item is not part of the

document as originally stored;

displaying a selectable action item; and

linking the selectable action item to an executable function;

wherein selection of the selectable action item causes an execution of the executable function

(Col. 14, lines 30-40; Col. 13, lines 25-36).

12.   As per claim 7, DeRose teaches the method of claim 6, further comprises:

calling a function included in a hosted application responsive to the activation of the

selectable action item (Col. 17, lines 60-67).

13.   As per claim 8, DeRose teaches the method of claim 6, further comprises:

calling a function included in a client application responsive to the activation of the selectable

action item (Col. 18, lines 20-34).

14.   As per claim 9, DeRose teaches the method of claim 1, further comprises: transmitting

the rendered data to the user for viewing (Col. 17, lines 5-10; Col. 15, lines 1-10).

15.   As per claim 19, DeRose teaches a system for remotely viewing a centrally stored

document, the system comprising:

at least a first processor;

at least a first storage device connected to the at least a first processor (Fig 2); and

a plurality of instructions stored on the at least a first storage device (Col. 15, lines 25-30,

lines 55-61; Col. 16, lines 1-10, lines 15-20, lines 45-50), the plurality of instructions configured

to cause the at least a first processor to:

process a user identifier associated with a user attempting to access the document (Col. 16,

lines 30-42);

retrieve relationship data associated with the user (Col. 15, lines 5-10; Col. 9, lines 1-5);

receive, from the user, a request to access the document (Col. 5, lines 47-51);

retrieve a style sheet associated with the user and the requested document (Col. 13, lines 25-

35);

retrieve data associated with the document; and

render the retrieved data according to the retrieved style sheet (Col. 14, lines 45-50; Col.

13, lines 27-36; Col. 14, lines 32-40).

16.   As per claims 20-24, Claims 20-24 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to

claims 2-3, 5-7 above respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
> are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
> person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

18.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRose et al.

(hereinafter DeRose), US 6,167,409 in view of 'Official Notice'.

19.   As per claim 4, DeRose does not explicitly teach the method of claim 1, wherein the step

of rendering the retrieved data according to the retrieved style sheet comprises:

applying an XSL style sheet to the retrieved data.

However, 'Official Notice' is taken that the concept and advantages of providing for XSL is well

known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

include XSL with DeRose because it would provide for additional security.

20.   Claims 10-18 are rejected 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRose et al.

(hereinafter DeRose), US 6,167,409 in view of Mehra et al. (hereinafter Mehra), US

2002/0049603.

21.   As per claim 10, DeRose teaches a method for viewing documents electronically stored

in a central repository, the method comprises:

receiving, from a user, a request to access at least one document related to the operational

process (Col. 5, lines 47-51);

identifying the first document and the second document as being associated with the

operational process (Col. 16, lines 30-40; Col. 9, lines 10-20);

retrieving a format instruction associated with the user and the requested document (Col. 13,

lines 25-35);

retrieving data associated with the at least one document; and

rendering the retrieved data according to the retrieved format instruction (Col. 14, lines 45-

50; Col. 13, lines 27-36; Col. 14, lines 32-40).

22.   DeRose does not explicitly mention

receiving a first document from a first originating party, wherein the first document is

associated with an operational process;

storing the first document in the central repository;

receiving a second document from a second originating party, wherein the second document

is associated with the operational process;

storing the second document in the central repository;

23.   Mehra teaches

receiving a first document from a first originating party, wherein the first document is

associated with an operational process;

storing the first document in the central repository;

receiving a second document from a second originating party, wherein the second document

is associated with the operational process;

storing the second document in the central repository (pg 1, [0017]-[0018]);

24.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was

made to combine the teaching of DeRose and Mehra because they both dealing with central

storage of information on a server. Furthermore, the teaching of Mehra to allow

receiving a first document from a first originating party, wherein the first document is

associated with an operational process;

storing the first document in the central repository;

receiving a second document from a second originating party, wherein the second document

is associated with the operational process;

storing the second document in the central repository;

would improve the functionality for DeRose's system by allowing for various clients to upload

information data towards a centralized location.

25.   As per claim 11, DeRose teaches the method of claim 10, further comprising:

displaying an identifier for the first document and the second document in a hierarchical

arrangement (Col. 7, lines 60-67).

26.   As per claim 12, DeRose teaches the method of claim 10, further comprising:

receiving a user identifier associated with the user attempting to access the at least one

document (Col. 9, lines 1-5);

retrieving relationship data associated with the user (Col. 9, lines 1-5); and

restricting access to the first document and not the second document responsive to the user

identifier being associated with a restricted user identifier (Col. 9, lines 1-5; Col. 15, lines 5-10).

27.   As per claims 13-16, Claims 13-16 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to

claims 5-8 above respectively.

28.   As per claim 17, DeRose does not explicitly teach the method of claim 10, wherein the

operational process comprises a business process.

29.   Mehra teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the operational process comprises a

business process (pg 1, [0015]).

30.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was

made to combine the teaching of DeRose and Mehra because they both dealing with central

storage of information on a server. Furthermore, the teaching of Mehra to allow

    wherein the operational process comprises a business process

would improve the functionality for DeRose's system by allowing for usage of the system in a

business environment.

31.   As per claim 18, DeRose does not explicitly teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the

first originating party and the second originating party are different originating parties.

32.   Mehra teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the first originating party and the second

originating party are different originating parties (pg 1, [0017]-[0018]).

33.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was

made to combine the teaching of DeRose and Mehra because they both dealing with central

storage of information on a server. Furthermore, the teaching of Mehra to allow

    wherein the first originating party and the second originating party are different originating

parties

would improve the functionality for DeRose's system by allowing for data to be gathered from

multiple locations be located at a central location.

Conclusion

34.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art

with respect to "SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR RENDERING DOCUMENTS IN A USER

FAMILIAR FORMAT".

        i.   US 6578192   Boehme et al.

        ii.   US 2003/0133145   Koppich et al.

    Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0718. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-4:30pm.

    If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular

communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CZ
June 9, 2004

ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER